



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,317	06/20/2003	Brian J. Cragun	ROC920030231US1	9777

7590 05/31/2006

William J. McGinnis, Jr.
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

LIN, SHEW FEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,317

Applicant(s)

CRAGUN ET AL

Examiner

Shew-Fen Lin

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2166

DETAILED ACTION

- a. This action is responsive to amendment filed on March 16, 2006.
- b. Claims 1-26 are pending and claims 1-6 have been cancelled. Claims 7, 16 and 20 are independent claims.

Specification

In view of the amendment to the specification, the Examiner withdraws the pending objection to the specification.

Drawings

In view of the amendment to the drawings, the Examiner withdraws the pending objection to the drawings.

Withdrawal of Rejections/Objections

Applicants' amendments, submitted on 3/16/2006, overcome the 101 rejection (the rejected claims are cancelled). Examiner hereby withdrawn the rejection given in the Office Action dated 12/7/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 2166

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 102(e) as being anticipated by Bays et al. (US Patent 6,519,603, hereinafter referred as Bays).

As to claim 16, Bays discloses a computer-readable medium containing an executable component for configuring an annotation system for managing annotations created for data objects manipulated by one or more applications on a network (Figure 1) which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising:

providing at least one graphical user interface screen for defining annotation structures containing one or more annotation fields (Figures 2 and 3B, column 7, lines 15-18, lines 43-50, column 8, lines 45-52, column 9, lines 7-19) ; and

providing at least one graphical user interface screen for associating annotation structures with at least one annotatable data object (Figure 3B, column 9, lines 43-49).

As to claim 17, Bays discloses wherein the operations further comprise providing at least one graphical user interface screen for associating at least one role with at least one user (context reads on role, column 3, lines 10-14, column 9, lines 47-49).

As to claim 18, Bays discloses wherein the operations further comprise providing at least one graphical user interface screen for associating at least one transform with an annotation

Art Unit: 2166

structure, the transform for use in generating a graphical user interface based on the annotation structure (column 3, lines 20-33).

As to claim 19, Bays discloses wherein the operations further comprise providing at least one graphical user interface screen for specifying how users of users operating in different roles can access fields contained in an annotation structure (display annotation content based on the context of the reader, column 3, lines 25-33).

Claims 7-8, 12-21, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barger et al. (US Pub 2004/0205545, hereinafter referred as Barger).

As to claim 7, Barger discloses a method for exchanging information between entities on a network (exchanging information through annotation, paragraph [0005]) comprising:

installing an annotation management system on the network (Figure 4, paragraph [0037], lines 3-7);

identifying a plurality of annotatable data objects manipulated by a plurality of applications on the network (different content types and applications, paragraph [0021], lines 1-4, paragraph [0024], lines 5-14); and

providing a set of one or more configuration tools allowing a user to define an annotation structure containing one or more annotation fields and associate the annotation structure with at least one of the annotatable data objects (Figure 5, paragraph [0042], [0044], [0046] and [0052]).

As to claim 8, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration tools further allow a user to define roles and associate annotation structures with combinations of roles and annotatable data objects (Set element allows annotation structure to be grouped, paragraph [0056]).

As to claim 12, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration tools: allow a users to specify one or more annotation field groups (composite or sets, Figures 6 and 7, paragraph [0052], lines 1-3, paragraph [0056], lines 1-3); and allow annotation field groups to be added to annotation structures (paragraph [0051]).

As to claim 13, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration tools allow a user to associate one or more transforms with an annotation structure, the transforms for use in converting the annotation structure into a graphical user interface (convert annotation structure to corresponding type of annotation, text, multimedia, Figures 2-3).

As to claim 14, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration tools allow a user to associate an annotation structure with annotatable data objects associated with more than one data source (each annotation can include multiple context anchors, paragraph [0030], lines 6-17).

As to claim 15, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration tools allows annotatable sub-objects of data objects to be associated with annotation structures (define relationship between content being annotated and the content that is annotating, Figure 1, paragraph [0025])

As to claim 20, Barger on a system for managing annotations for one or more different type data sources manipulated by a plurality of different type applications (paragraph [0021], lines 1-4), comprising:

an annotation database for storing annotations separately from the data sources associated with the annotations (annotation store, SQL database, Figure 4, item 140, paragraph [0039], lines 1-8);

a set of annotatable data object points defining portions of the data sources associated with the annotations described by the associated annotations (Figure 1, paragraph [0027], lines 1-10, paragraph [0056]);

an annotation server configured to receive requests to access annotations for one or more of the annotatable data object points issued by the one or more of the applications running on the client computer and generate a graphical user interface screen (create/view/edit/delete annotation, Figures 10-13, paragraph [0037], lines 8-19), based on an annotation structure associated with the one or more of the annotatable data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for the one or more annotatable data object points (paragraph [0049], lines 4-14); and

one or more configuration tools allowing a user to define annotation structures and associate annotation structures with one or more of the annotatable data object points (Figures 5-7, paragraph [0042], paragraph [0046])

Art Unit: 2166

As to claim 21, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration tools allow users to associate a single annotation structure with annotatable data object points associated with more than one data source (paragraph [0030], lines 4-7, paragraph [0051], paragraph [0056]).

As to claim 23, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration tools allow users to associate one or more annotation structures with at least one of:

one or more combinations of annotatable data object points and roles; or

one or more combinations of annotatable data object points and users (define relationship between content being annotated and the content that is annotating, Figure 1, paragraph [0025], paragraph [0056]).

As to claim 24, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration tools allow users to associate one or more transforms with one or more annotation structures, each transform for use in generating a graphical user interface based on an associated annotation structure (convert annotation structure to corresponding type of annotation, text, multimedia, Figures 2-3).

As to claim 25, Barger on discloses further comprising a plurality of configuration files and wherein the configure tools allow a user to navigate and modify one or more of the configuration files (paragraph [0059] and [0075]).

As to claim 26, Barger on discloses wherein the configuration files are extensible markup language (XML) files (paragraph [0059]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 9 –11, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bargerion as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Tada et al. (US Patent 6,490,583, hereinafter referred as Tada).

As to claim 9, Bargerion discloses the elements of claims 7 as noted above and group annotations together for access control (paragraph [0056], lines 1-3) but does not explicitly

Art Unit: 2166

discloses provide one or more graphical user interface screens for associating one or more roles with a user.

Tada discloses associating one or more group (roles) with a user (Figures 2-3, column 4, lines 1-8, column 5, lines 63-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Bargerion's disclosure to include associating user to one or more groups (roles) as taught by Tada for the purpose of allowing user to access the information for each group to which the users belong (column 2, lines 32-34, Tada). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Bargerion per the above such that access control to group level is easy to carry out (column 1, lines 59-65, Tada).

As to claim 10, Bargerion discloses the elements of claims 7 as noted above and group annotations together for access control (paragraph [0056], lines 1-3) but does not explicitly discloses provide one or more graphical user interface screens for associating one or more users with a role.

Tada discloses associating one or more users with a group (role) (Figures 2-3, column 4, lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Bargerion's disclosure to include associating user to one or more groups (roles) as taught by Tada for the purpose of allowing user to access the information for each group to which the users belong (column 2, lines 32-34, Tada). The skilled artisan would have

Art Unit: 2166

been motivated to improve the invention of Barger on per the above such that access control to group level is easy to carry out (column 1, lines 59-65, Tada).

As to **claim 11**, Barger on discloses the elements of claims 7 as noted above and group annotations together for access control (paragraph [0056], lines 1-3) but does not explicitly disclose specify one or more filters specifying how annotation fields contained in an annotation structure can be manipulated based on user roles.

Tada discloses depending on the groups (roles) the users belonging to, users can only access the documentations (reads on annotation), which are accessible for the groups based on access control determination (Figure 8, column 6, lines 23-26, column 7, lines 55-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Barger on's disclosure to include associating documentation (annotation) to one or more groups (roles) as taught by Tada for the purpose of allowing user to access the information after filtering with access control (column 2, lines 64-65, Tada). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Barger on per the above such that access control can be conducted based on the groups (roles) to which users belong (column 2, lines 47-50, Tada).

As to **claim 22**, Barger on discloses the elements of claims 20 as noted above and group annotations together for access control (paragraph [0056], lines 1-3) but does not explicitly disclose allow users to associate one or more roles with one or more users.

Art Unit: 2166

Tada discloses associating one or more group (roles) with one or more users (Figures 2-3, column 4, lines 1-8, column 5, lines 44-47, lines 63-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Bargerion's disclosure to include associating one or more groups (roles) to one or more users as taught by Tada for the purpose of allowing user to access the information for each group to which the users belong (column 2, lines 32-34, Tada). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Bargerion per the above such that access control to group level is easy to carry out (column 1, lines 59-65, Tada).

Response to Remarks

Applicant's remarks submitted on March 16, 2006 with respect to claims 1-26 have been fully reconsidered but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Response to remarks on claim rejections (7, 20) based on Bargerion

Applicant contends that Bargerion et al. (US Pub 2004/0205545, hereafter Bargerion) do not teach the limitation of "one or more configuration tools allowing a user to define an annotation structure" because the reference directed only to an annotation schema and not to a "configuration tool". The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assessment for the following reason.

First, based on MPEP 2111 [R1] Claim Interpretation -Broadest Reasonable Interpretation: During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). "Configuration" is commonly defined as "define /specify the attributes of an object" (see The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, seventh

Art Unit: 2166

edition) and any hardware/software that can be used to define/specify the attributes of an object is qualified as “configuration tool”. Bargerion disclosed that the annotation could be extended with client application-defined data and/or functionality (abstract, paragraph [0032], paragraph [0149], lines 4-14). Client or client application can define user-defined type annotation by configuring item 164 (Figure 5, paragraph [0044]).

Second, Bargerion discloses configuring “a composite anchor” by grouping one/more anchor (paragraph [0052]). A composite anchor allows more structure to be specified in an annotation and therefore can be used as a configuration tool to define structure.

Third, Figure 5 is used to provide structural view for the user-defined element item 164 to support paragraph [0042], [0044], [0046].

Therefore, the Examiner’s stance regarding the status of claims 7, 20 and all those claims depending from it, remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

Response to remarks on claim rejections (16) based on Bays

Applicant contends that Bays et al. (US 6,519,603, hereafter Bays) do not teach the limitation of “providing at least one graphical user interface screen for defining annotation structures containing one or more annotation fields” because Figure 2 is described as “a schematic or an exemplary computer screen 50 that can be generated using the information management system...” for viewing data and annotation, not for “defining annotation structure”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assessment for the following reason.

First, Bays clearly teaches that “Define Annotation Structure” in Figure 3B, item 135. The annotation structure is defined by selected sub-structure (category), which can be one or more fields (attributes) (column 8, lines 45-52). The administrator defines category first, define

Art Unit: 2166

annotation structure based on selected categories, and then build the new annotation structure (column 9, lines 7-10, lines 31-41). Furthermore, Bays refers administrator to item 27 as shown in Figure 1A as a graphical user interface (GUI) to facilitate the interaction with information management system (column 7, lines 9-14). Therefore, Bays teaches all the elements of “a graphical user interface screen for defining annotation structures containing one or more annotation fields”.

Second, viewing and annotation is only part of the function of Figure 2. Administrator can use Figure 2 to define annotation structure (column 9, lines 11-19).

Therefore, the Examiner’s stance regarding the status of claim 16, and all those claims depending from it, remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2166

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shew-Fen Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-2672. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Shew-Fen Lin
Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2166
May 15, 2006



**MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER**